

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

* * *

MICHAEL J. BOGGAN,

Plaintiff,

v.

CAROLYN W. COLVIN,
Acting Commissioner
agent of
Social Security Administration

Defendant.

Case No.: 2:13-cv-01687-RFB-VCF

**ORDER ACCEPTING REPORT &
RECOMMENDATION OF
MAGISTRATE JUDGE CAM V.
FERENBACH**

Before the Court for consideration is the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 22) of the Honorable Cam V. Ferenbach, United States Magistrate Judge, entered May 22, 2014.

A district court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). A party may file specific written objections to the findings and recommendations of a magistrate judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Local Rule IB 3-2(a). When written objections have been filed, the district court is required to “make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); see also Local Rule IB 3-2(b). Where a party fails to object, however, a district court is not required to conduct

“any review,” *de novo* or otherwise, of the report and recommendations of a magistrate judge. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985).

Pursuant to Local Rule IB 3-2(a), objections were due by June 8, 2014. No objections have been filed. The Court has reviewed the record in this case and concurs with Magistrate Judge’s recommendation(s) that (ECF No.15) Plaintiff’s Motion for Reversal be GRANTED and the case be remanded for further proceedings. IT IS FURTHER RECOMMENDED that (ECF No. 19) Defendant’s Cross Motion to Affirm be DENIED. Therefore, the Court has determined that Magistrate Judge’s Recommendation should be **ACCEPTED** and **ADOPTED** to the extent that it is not inconsistent with this opinion.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 22) is **ACCEPTED and ADOPTED in full**. (ECF No.15) Plaintiff’s Motion for Reversal be GRANTED and the case be remanded for further proceedings. IT IS FURTHER RECOMMENDED that (ECF No. 19) Defendant’s Cross Motion to Affirm be DENIED.

The Clerk shall enter judgment accordingly and close case.

DATED this 21st day of November, 2014.



RICHARD F. BOULWARE II
United States District Court Judge